



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,693	09/29/2003	Lester Cornelius	28,332-CIP	7411
7590	03/07/2006			
Charles E. Temko 22 Marion Road Westport, CT 06880				EXAMINER NAKARANI, DHIRAJLAL S
				ART UNIT 1773
				PAPER NUMBER 1773

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/671,693	CORNELIUS, LESTER
	Examiner D. S. Nakarani	Art Unit 1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Page 696 of Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition (1988)..

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 7 and 8 are improper because these claims are not in form of a single as required (see MPEP 608.01(m)). Appropriate correction is required.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-3 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 2, the phrase “first inner synthetic resinous layer” renders claims indefinite because it is not clear from the claim language that the first layer is an inner layer with respect to what since only two layers are recited. The laminate formed by bonding first layer to the second recited outer layer. Thus formed laminate has both the first and the second layers as outer layers. Therefore recitation of first inner layer cannot be understood. Does applicant is trying to claim the recited first layer sandwiched between two recited outer layers? Clarification and/or correction requested.

4. Claims 1-3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miro (U. S. Patent 6,166,852) in view of Pavelka et al (U. S. Patent 5,387,458) for the reasons of

record set forth in paragraph 5 of the Office Action mailed August 16, 2004 (Paper Number 20040724).

5. Claims 7-10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Applicant's arguments filed October 7, 2004 and December 23, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In reference to rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph applicant states in response filed October 7, 2004 that the ground of rejection is not understood by applicant. Since two layers are recited, it should be apparent that the first layer is an inner layer with respect to the outer layer, and the outer layer is both "outer" with respect to the inner layer.

These arguments are unpersuasive because the Examiner does not understand what is meant by "the outer layer is both "outer" with respect to the inner layer. Does applicant trying to claim the first inner synthetic resinous layer is sandwiched between two second outer layer(s)? As per Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, page 696 (copy enclosed), the word "inner" means located farther within, interior, internal, and central. Thus in two layer coating system both recited layers are outer layers.

In reference to rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miro (U. S. Patent 6,166,852) in view of Pavelka et al (U. S. Patent 5,387,458), applicant mainly argues that either of these references (i.e. Miro and Pavelka et al) teach a first layer having an

ultraviolet absorber having an ultraviolet cut-off lower than 385 nanometers, nor a fluorescent material which reflects ultraviolet radiation of wavelength above 385 nanometers; all of this being present in a single layer.

These arguments are not persuasive because both references teach outer layer (i.e. layer 15 in Miro and the screen layer in Pavelka et al) contains ultraviolet absorber such as and the inner layer (i.e. adhesive layer 16 in Miro and color layer in Pavelka et al) contains fluorescent material such as Uvitex OB of CIBA which is the same fluorescent material as used in the present disclosure. The Examiner agrees that Miro does not teach addition of ultraviolet absorber in the adhesive layer 16. However Pavelka et al disclose addition of ultraviolet radiation screening agent (i.e. ultraviolet absorber) in color layer containing fluorescent dye (i.e. fluorescent material) improves fluorescent durability of the fluorescent dye. Therefore it is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention made to utilize teaching of Pavelka et al in the invention of Miro to add ultraviolet absorber in the adhesive layer 16 to improve fluorescent durability of fluorescent dye.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. S. Nakarani whose telephone number is (571) 272-1512. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



D. S. Nakarani
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

Dsn
March 03, 2006